



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/082,132	02/26/2002	Stephen W. Hoxie	WRAIR99-54 04	5384

27370 7590 07/05/2006

OFFICE OF THE STAFF JUDGE ADVOCATE  
U.S. ARMY MEDICAL RESEARCH AND MATERIEL COMMAND  
ATTN: MCMR-JA (MS. ELIZABETH ARWINE)  
504 SCOTT STREET  
FORT DETRICK, MD 21702-5012

EXAMINER

TOMASZEWSKI, MICHAEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3626

DATE MAILED: 07/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



## DETAILED ACTION

### *Notice To Applicant*

1. This communication is in response to the response to the Restriction Requirement/Election Requirement filed 5/4/2006. Claims 1-20 and 28-42 are pending. Claims 4 and 10 have been amended. Claims 21-27 have been cancelled. Claims 36-42 are newly added. Claims 1-9, 28-35, and 41-42 have been elected. The IDS statements filed 5/23/2002, 6/4/2002, 6/27/2002 and 2/27/2003 have been entered and considered.

### *Election/Restrictions*

2. Claims 10-14, 15-20 and 36-40 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 6/5/2006.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2, 4, 8-9, and 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rockwell ([www.rli.com](http://www.rli.com); hereinafter Rockwell), in view of Lavin et al. (5,772,585; hereinafter Lavin).

(A) As per claim 1, Rockwell discloses a computer-readable medium containing a data structure for storing laser accident and incident information comprising:

- (1) an incident table containing an entry for each of a plurality of incidents, each entry carrying an identification (Rockwell: pg. 5); and
- (2) a laser table containing at least one entry for at least one entry in said incident table linked by said identification, said laser table containing a laser identification (Rockwell: pg. 6).

Rockwell, however, fails to expressly disclose a computer-readable medium containing a data structure for storing laser accident and incident information comprising:

- (3) a clinical evaluation table containing at least one entry for each entry in said incident table linked by said identification, said clinical evaluation table containing clinical evaluation information.

Nevertheless, these features are old and well known in the art, as evidenced by Lavin. In particular, Lavin discloses a computer-readable medium containing a data structure for storing laser accident and incident information comprising:

- (3) a clinical evaluation table containing at least one entry for each entry in said incident table linked by said identification, said clinical evaluation table containing clinical evaluation information (Lavin: abstract; col. 1, line 65-col. 3, line 12; Fig. 13-19).

One of ordinary skill would have found it obvious at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Lavin with the teachings of Rockwell with the motivation of providing a graphical user interface to access medical files (Lavin: col. 1, lines 53-63).

Art Unit: 3626

(B) As per claim 2, Rockwell fails to expressly disclose the data structure according to claim 1, wherein said clinical evaluation table contains a clinical identification for each entry, said data structure further comprising:

- (1) an examination table containing at least one entry that corresponds to at least one entry in said clinical evaluation table linked by the clinical identification, said examination table containing evaluation information and an examination identification.

Nevertheless, these features are old and well known in the art, as evidenced by Lavin. In particular, Lavin discloses the data structure according to claim 1, wherein said clinical evaluation table contains a clinical identification for each entry (Lavin: abstract; col. 1, line 65-col. 3, line 12; Fig. 13-19), said data structure further comprising:

- (1) an examination table containing at least one entry that corresponds to at least one entry in said clinical evaluation table linked by the clinical identification, said examination table containing evaluation information and an examination identification (Lavin: abstract; col. 1, line 65-col. 3, line 12; Fig. 13-24).

One of ordinary skill would have found it obvious at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Lavin with the teachings of Rockwell with the motivation of providing a graphical user interface to access medical files (Lavin: col. 1, lines 53-63).

(C) As per claim 4, Rockwell discloses the data structure according to claim 1, further comprising a bibliography table containing a corresponding entry for each entry in said incident table linked by said identification, said bibliography table containing bibliographic information for the incident corresponding to said identification (Rockwell: pg. 3).

(D) As per claim 8, Rockwell discloses a computer-readable medium containing a data structure for injury information comprising:

- (1) an injury table containing an entry for each of a plurality of injuries, each entry having an identification (Rockwell: pg. 6); and
- (2) a cause table containing a corresponding entry for each entry in said injury table linked by said identification, said cause table containing a description of how the injury occurred (Rockwell: pg. 6).

Rockwell, however, fails to expressly disclose a computer-readable medium containing a data structure for injury information comprising:

- (3) a clinical evaluation table containing at least one entry for each entry in said injury table linked by said identification, said clinical evaluation table containing medical information.

Nevertheless, these features are old and well known in the art, as evidenced by Lavin. In particular, Lavin discloses a computer-readable medium containing a data structure for injury information comprising:

- (3) a clinical evaluation table containing at least one entry for each entry in said injury table linked by said identification, said clinical evaluation table containing medical information (Lavin: abstract; col. 1, line 65-col. 3, line 12; Fig. 13-19).

One of ordinary skill would have found it obvious at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Lavin with the teachings of Rockwell with the motivation of providing a graphical user interface to access medical files (Lavin: col. 1, lines 53-63).

- (E) As per claim 9, Rockwell discloses the data structure according to claim 8, further comprising a source table containing a corresponding entry for each entry in said injury table linked by said identification, said source table containing information relating to the source of the information (Rockwell: pg. 3).



(F) Claim 41 substantially repeats the same limitations as those in claim 1 and therefore, is rejected for substantially the same reasons given for claim 1 and incorporated herein.

(G) As per claim 42, Rockwell discloses the data structure according to claim 41, wherein said incident table includes a summary section and an exposure section (Rockwell: pg. 6).

5. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rockwell and Lavin, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Joao (6,283,761; Joao).

(A) As per claim 3, Rockwell fails to expressly disclose the data structure according to claim 2, further comprising:

- (1) an images table containing at least one entry that corresponds to at least one entry in said examination table linked by the examination identification, said images table containing data to form digital representations of the injury occurring from the incident; and
- (2) an examination type table containing at least one entry that corresponds to at least one entry in said examination table linked by the examination

identification, said examination type table containing an identification of an examination given to an injured subject.

Nevertheless, these features are old and well known in the art, as evidenced by Lavin and Joao. In particular, Lavin and Joao disclose the data structure according to claim 2, further comprising:

- (1) an images table containing at least one entry that corresponds to at least one entry in said examination table linked by the examination identification, said images table containing data to form digital representations of the injury occurring from the incident (Joao: abstract; col. 7, lines 49-61; col. 16, line 66-col. 17, line 12); and
- (2) an examination type table containing at least one entry that corresponds to at least one entry in said examination table linked by the examination identification, said examination type table containing an identification of an examination given to an injured subject (Lavin: abstract; col. 1, line 65-col. 3, line 12; Fig. 13-24).

One of ordinary skill would have found it obvious at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Lavin with the combined teachings of Rockwell and Joao with the motivation of providing a graphical user interface to access medical files (Lavin: col. 1, lines 53-63).

One of ordinary skill would have found it obvious at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Joao with the combined teachings of Rockwell and Lavin with the motivation of processing medical information (Joao: col. 7, lines 62-65).

6. Claims 5-6, and 28-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rockwell and Lavin, as applied to claims 1 and 28 above, and further in view of Official Notice.

(A) As per claim 5, Rockwell fails to expressly disclose the computer-readable medium according to claim 1, wherein the computer-readable medium is a carrier wave.

Nevertheless, Official Notice is taken that the technique of using carrier waves as computer-readable mediums to transmit information is old and well known. Using modulated radio signals is an example of this technique and was old and well known at the time of the present invention.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious at the time of the invention to combine this technique with the combined teachings of Rockwell and Lavin with the motivation of facilitating the transmission of information.

(B) As per claim 6, Rockwell discloses a system comprising:

- (1) means for storing a database of incidents (Rockwell: pg. 3); and
- (2) means for displaying information queried from said storing means by said query means (Rockwell: pg. 6).

Rockwell, however, fails to *expressly* disclose a system comprising:

- (3) means for querying information from said storing means.

Nevertheless, these features are old and well known, as evidenced by Lavin. In particular, Lavin discloses a system comprising:

- (3) means for querying information from said storing means (Lavin: col. 14, lines 36-47).

One of ordinary skill would have found it obvious at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Lavin with the teachings of Rockwell with the motivation of providing a graphical user interface to access medical files (Lavin: col. 1, lines 53-63).

Examiner has also taken Official Notice of the techniques of storing information in a database, querying databases, displaying database information, recalling queries, query definitions, and storing query definitions, among other techniques claimed by Applicant, are all notoriously well known techniques within the computer arts, as are the various technologies claimed by Applicant including the means for performing the

Art Unit: 3626

aforementioned techniques, browsers, servers, databases, SQL, memories, query buttons, query engines, websites/web pages, interface engines, controllers, clients, icons, icon libraries, templates, and networks. These techniques and technologies were widely used and well known at the time of Applicant's invention. For example, Microsoft Access®, Microsoft Explorer®, Google®, and Yahoo®, are all examples of applications that incorporate these techniques and technologies.

As such, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to combine these techniques and technologies with Rockwell and Lavin with the motivation of effectively and efficiently storing, retrieving, and displaying various data.

(C) As per claim 28, Rockwell discloses a laser accident and incident registry system comprising:

- (1) a database storing the laser accident and incident registry, said database connected to said interface engine (Rockwell: pg. 3).

Rockwell, however, fails to expressly disclose a laser accident and incident registry system comprising:

- (2) a controller having a browser (Lavin: abstract; col. 1, lines 52-63); and

- (3) an interface engine connected to said controller (Lavin: abstract; col. 1, lines 52-63).

Nevertheless, these features are old and well known in the art, as evidenced by Lavin. In particular, Lavin discloses a laser accident and incident registry system comprising:

- (2) a controller having a browser (Lavin: abstract; col. 1, lines 52-63); and
- (3) an interface engine connected to said controller (Lavin: abstract; col. 1, lines 52-63).

One of ordinary skill would have found it obvious at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Lavin with the teachings of Rockwell with the motivation of providing a graphical user interface to access medical files (Lavin: col. 1, lines 53-63).

Examiner has also taken Official Notice of the techniques of storing information in a database, querying databases, displaying database information, recalling queries, query definitions, and storing query definitions, among other techniques claimed by Applicant, are all notoriously well known techniques within the computer arts, as are the various technologies claimed by Applicant including the means for performing the aforementioned techniques, browsers, servers, databases, SQL, memories, query buttons, query engines, websites/web pages, interface engines, controllers, clients, icons, icon libraries, templates, and networks. These techniques and technologies were

widely used and well known at the time of Applicant's invention. For example, Microsoft Access®, Microsoft Explorer®, Google®, and Yahoo®, are all examples of applications that incorporate these techniques and technologies.

As such, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to combine these techniques and technologies with Rockwell and Lavin with the motivation of effectively and efficiently storing, retrieving, and displaying various data.

(D) Examiner has taken Official Notice of claims 29-35. As previously mentioned, the techniques of storing information in a database, querying databases, displaying database information, recalling queries, query definitions, and storing query definitions, among other techniques claimed by Applicant, are all notoriously well known techniques within the computer arts, as are the various technologies claimed by Applicant including the means for performing the aforementioned techniques, browsers, servers, databases, SQL, memories, query buttons, query engines, websites/web pages, interface engines, controllers, clients, icons, icon libraries, templates, template libraries, and networks. These techniques and technologies were widely used and well known at the time of Applicant's invention. For example, Microsoft Access®, Microsoft Explorer®, Google®, and Yahoo®, are all examples of applications that incorporate these techniques and technologies.

As such, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to combine these techniques and technologies with Rockwell and Lavin

with the motivation of effectively and efficiently storing, retrieving, and displaying various data.

7. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rockwell, Lavin, and Official Notice, as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Fernandez et al. (5,956,720; hereinafter Fernandez).

(A) As per claim 7, Rockwell fails to expressly disclose the system according to claim 6, wherein said query means includes:

- (1) means for storing query definitions; and
- (2) means for recalling previous query definitions from said query storing means.

Nevertheless, these features are old and well known in the art, as evidenced by Fernandez. In particular, Fernandez discloses the system according to claim 6, wherein said query means includes:

- (1) means for storing query definitions (Fernandez: col. 2, lines 46-57); and
- (2) means for recalling previous query definitions from said query storing means (Fernandez: col. 4, lines 7-23).



One of ordinary skill would have found it obvious at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Fernandez with the combined teachings of Rockwell and Lavin with the motivation of effectively and efficiently storing, retrieving, and displaying various data (Fernandez: col. 2, lines 41-45).

Examiner has also taken Official Notice of the techniques of storing information in a database, querying databases, displaying database information, recalling queries, query definitions, and storing query definitions, among other techniques claimed by Applicant, are all notoriously well known techniques within the computer arts, as are the various technologies claimed by Applicant including the means for performing the aforementioned techniques, browsers, servers, databases, SQL, memories, query buttons, query engines, websites/web pages, interface engines, controllers, clients, icons, icon libraries, templates, and networks. These techniques and technologies were widely used and well known at the time of Applicant's invention. For example, Microsoft Access®, Microsoft Explorer®, Google®, and Yahoo®, are all examples of applications that incorporate these techniques and technologies.

As such, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to combine these techniques and technologies with Rockwell, Lavin and Fernandez with the motivation of effectively and efficiently storing, retrieving, and displaying various data.

### ***Conclusion***

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. The cited but not applied art teaches systems and methods for performing crawl searches and index searches (US 2002/0147880); a system for composing a graphical interface to a relational database which displays a network of query and source icons (5,428,776); an imaging system protocol handling method and apparatus (6,272,469); a method and apparatus for reporting emergency incidents (6,594,634); a computer-implemented process for reporting injured worker information (6,065,000); and a method and apparatus for utilizing annotations to facilitate computer retrieval of database material (5,404,295).

The cited but not applied prior art also includes non-patent literature by IDG Books Worldwide ("Windows 95 For Dummies" Copyright 1995.); IDG Books Worldwide ("Excel For Windows 95 For Dummies" Copyright 1995.); IDG Books Worldwide ("The Internet For Dummies" Copyright 1995.); IDG Books Worldwide ("Client/Server Computing For Dummies" Copyright 1999.); Faithe Wempen ("10 Minute Guide to Access 97" Copyright 1995. Que Corporation.); and Frank J. Derfler, Jr. & Les Freed ("How Networks Work" Copyright 2000. Que Corporation.).

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mike Tomaszewski whose telephone number is (571)272-8117. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00 am - 3:30 pm.

Art Unit: 3626

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on (571)272-6776. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MT



C. LUKE GILLIGAN  
PATENT EXAMINER